1	BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD	
2		E OF WASHINGTON
3	IN THE MATTER OF THE TOWN OF IONE,)
4	Appellant,	PCHB No. 82-184
5	v.) FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
6	STATE OF WASHINGTON,) CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER
7	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, and DUWYNE GEIST,)
8	·	
9	Respondents.))

This matter, the appeal of a Washington State Department of Ecology's Report of Examination on Surface Water Permit Application No. S3-26707 of Duwyne Geist, came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board in a formal hearing on March 17, 1983, in Spokane, Washington. Seated for and as the Board were Gayle Rothrock (presiding) and Lawrence J. Faulk. The proceedings were recorded by Anita Lowe O'Brien, court reporter.

Appellant was represented by William E. Crist, Water Commissioner for the Town of Ione. Respondent Department of Ecology was

represented by Wick Dufford, Assistant Attorney General for the

Department of Ecology at Olympia, Washington. Mr. Geist represented

himself.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were admitted and examined. Oral and written argument was taken into the record. From the testimony, evidence and argument the Board makes these

FINDINGS OF FACT

Ι

Appellant City of Ione has appealed the proposed granting of permit No. S3-26707 to respondent Duwyne Geist.

ΙI

The four-part criteria for the issuance by DOE of a permit to appropriate public surface water as set forth in RCW 90.03.290 is that:

- 1. water is available for appropriation
- 2. for a beneficial use
- 3. and the appropriation will not impair existing rights
- 4. nor be detrimental to the public welfare.

III

This case involves a single surface water source from Cedar Creek. Various measurements of the Creek indicate a flow of approximately 2.1 cubic feet per second to 4.0 cubic feet per second during years of low flows. This data is supported by a United States Geological Survey Report entitled "Low Flow Characteristics of Selected Streams in Northern Eastern Washington."

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 82-184

26 | FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, | CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER 27 | PCHB NO. 82-184

The place of use is located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Town of Ione in their watershed, on a 20-acre parcel bisected by Cedar Creek. The point of diversion is in Cedar Creek Canyon which is behind and west of Mr. Geist's completed home.

V

The Department of Ecology records indicate two surface water withdrawals downstream from the applicant's point of diversion. The first results from surface water Certificate No. 6819 authorizing 0.02 cubic feet per second withdrawal from Cedar Creek. The second is the Town of Ione's water right Claim No. 001492 claiming approximately 3.6 cubic feet per second withdrawal from Cedar Creek for municipal use.

VI

The Town of Ione concedes that Mr. Geist's withdrawal of 0.02 cubic feet per second will not significantly affect the availability of water for use by the town. However, they also argue that if Mr. Geist's application is approved, then other development will follow which could lead to the possible pollution of the town's watershed and Cedar Creek.

VII

In addressing the water availability concern, it has been shown that water has been available and will continue to be available. Late in the summer of 1981, the Department of Ecology observed two to three inches of water going over the Town of Ione's storage reservoir dam on Cedar Creek. In June of 1982, the Department of Ecology observed

approximately twelve inches of water going over the dam. Furthermore, at such time as the waters of Cedar Creek are found to be depleted due to drought or abuse, the Department of Ecology shall have the authority to regulate all water diversions from Cedar Creek by date of priority.

VIII

Any possible pollution of Cedar Creek is diminished by the existence of applicant's drainfield and septic system which has been installed. In addition, the Town of Ione treats its water before it is diverted into their storage facility. The Pend Oreille County Health Department has made approving comments on Mr. Geist's proposed water withdrawal from Cedar Creek. The Department of Game has signed off on this application with a provision that screening be installed to prevent fish from being drawn into the diversion.

ΙX

If appellant's diversion is approved, there is sufficient water available to supply appellant and all current appropriators. The water to be appropriated is for a beneficial use. The appropriation will not impair existing water rights and will not be detrimental to the public welfare.

Х

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board enters these

 27

7.3

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 82-184

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

The Report of Examination recommending issuance of Permit No. \$3-26707 was accomplished by DOE in accordance with RCW 90.03.290 and RCW 90.54.

ΙI

In this matter the burden of proof is on the appellant to establish that the Department of Ecology erred in issuing the favorable Report of Examination on Application No. S3-26707 to Mr. Geist. Appellant has failed to sustain the burden of proof. However, the Board notes that the Department of Ecology should have discussed this application and watershed protection matters more directly with the elected and appointed officials of the town.

III

A modest appropriation of surface water for domestic uses in Cedar Creek in this circumstance will not, in any respect, be detrimental to the public welfare. RCW 90.54.

ΙV

The order of DOE which directed the issuance of the subject permit to respondent Mr. Geist should be affirmed because DOE has affirmatively shown that the permit was properly issued.

IV

Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

From these Conclusions the Board enters this

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB NO. 82-184

 21

ORDER The Order and Report of Examination of the Department of Ecology authorizing the issuance of permit No. S3-26707 for appropriation of public surface water is hereby affirmed. DATED this 16th day of April, 1983. POLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

PCHB No. 82-184